

RECEIVED AZ CORP COMMISSION

	ion		
JIM IRVIN Chairman TONY WEST COMMISSIONER REPLY OF U S WEST TO US WEST TO COMPLIANCE WITH § 271 OF THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF TO U S WEST'S IDENTIFYIN UPON IN ITS 271 APPLICATIONS ACT OF TO US WEST'S IDENTIFYIN TO US WEST'S IDENTIFYIN TO US WEST'S IDENTIFYIN UPON IN ITS 271 APPLICATIONS ACT OF TO US WEST'S IDENTIFYIN UPON IN ITS 271 APPLICATIONS ACT OF TO US WEST'S IDENTIFYIN UPON IN ITS 271 APPLICATIONS ACT OF TO US WEST'S IDENTIFYIN UPON IN ITS 271 APPLICATIONS ACT OF TO US WEST'S IDENTIFYIN UPON IN ITS 271 APPLICATIONS ACT OF TO US WEST'S IDENTIFYING TO US WEST'S IDENTIFYI			
TONY WEST Commissioner CARL J. KUNASEK Commissioner Docket No. T-00000B-97-0238			
CARL J. KUNASEK Commissioner Docket No. T-00000B-97-0238 IN THE MATTER OF U S WEST COMMUNICATIONS, INC.'S COMPLIANCE WITH § 271 OF THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF TO U S WEST'S IDENTIFYIN US WEST respectfully submits this Reply to the "Response" by the Joint Inte US WEST respectfully submits this Reply to the "Response" by the Joint Inte Statement of U S WEST Identifying SGAT Provisions Relied Upon in its 271 Applicates response to the Joint Intervenors' pleading, U S WEST states as follows: The Joint Intervenors filed their Response, despite the fact that they assert that action is necessary. U S WEST agrees that no further action is necessary. However, U submits this Reply to clarify the issues raised in the Joint Intervenors' Response. The only issue raised by the Joint Intervenors' Response is whether the Comm			
10 Docket No. T-00000B-97-0238 IN THE MATTER OF U S WEST COMMUNICATIONS, INC.'S PREPLY OF U S WEST TO COMPLIANCE WITH § 271 OF THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF TO U S WEST'S IDENTIFYIN 1996 POON IN ITS 271 APPLICATION OF TO US WEST TO UPON IN ITS 271 APPLICATION OF TO US WEST TO UPON IN ITS 271 APPLICATION OF TO US WEST TO UPON IN ITS 271 APPLICATION OF TO US WEST TO UPON IN ITS 271 APPLICATION OF TO US WEST TO UPON IN ITS 271 APPLICATION OF TO US WEST TO UPON IN ITS 271 APPLICATION OF TO US WEST TO UPON IN ITS 271 APPLICATION OF TO US WEST IDENTIFYIN UPON IN ITS 271 APPLICATION OF TO US WEST IDENTIFY OF TO US WEST STATES AS FOLLOWS: The Joint Intervenors' pleading, U S WEST states as follows: The Joint Intervenors filed their Response, despite the fact that they assert that action is necessary. U S WEST agrees that no further action is necessary. However, US US WEST agrees that no further action is necessary. However, US US WEST agrees that no further action is necessary. However, US US WEST agrees that no further action is necessary. However, US US WEST agrees that no further action is necessary. However, US US WEST agrees that no further action is necessary. However, US US WEST agrees that no further action is necessary. However, US US WEST agrees that no further action is necessary. However, US US WEST agrees that no further action is necessary. However, US US WEST agrees that no further action is necessary. However, US US WEST agrees that no further action is necessary.			
8 IN THE MATTER OF U S WEST 9 COMMUNICATIONS, INC.'S) REPLY OF U S WEST TO 10 TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF) TO U S WEST'S IDENTIFYIN 11 US WEST respectfully submits this Reply to the "Response" by the Joint Inte 12 U S WEST Identifying SGAT Provisions Relied Upon in its 271 Applica 13 response to the Joint Intervenors' pleading, U S WEST states as follows: 14 The Joint Intervenors filed their Response, despite the fact that they assert that 15 action is necessary. U S WEST agrees that no further action is necessary. However, U 16 submits this Reply to clarify the issues raised in the Joint Intervenors' Response. 17 The only issue raised by the Joint Intervenors' Response is whether the Communication.			
COMMUNICATIONS, INC.'S 9 COMPLIANCE WITH § 271 OF THE 10 10 11 11 12 U S WEST respectfully submits this Reply to the "Response" by the Joint Intervenors' pleading, U S WEST states as follows: 15 The Joint Intervenors filed their Response, despite the fact that they assert that action is necessary. U S WEST agrees that no further action is necessary. However, U submits this Reply to clarify the issues raised in the Joint Intervenors' Response. 18 COMMUNICATIONS, INC.'S "REPLY OF U S WEST TO "RESPONSE" OF JOINT MO "RESPONSE			
TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996 SGAT PROVISIONS RELIED 1996 UPON IN ITS 271 APPLICATIONS ACT OF 1996 SGAT PROVISIONS RELIED 1996 UPON IN ITS 271 APPLICATIONS ACT OF 1996 SGAT PROVISIONS RELIED 1996 UPON IN ITS 271 APPLICATIONS ACT OF 1996 TO UPON IN ITS 271 APPLICATIONS ACT OF 1996 SGAT PROVISIONS RELIED 1996 UPON IN ITS 271 APPLICATIONS ACT OF 1996 TO UPON IN ITS 271 APPLICATIONS ACT OF 1996 SGAT PROVISIONS RELIED 1996 UPON IN ITS 271 APPLICATIONS ACT OF 1996 SGAT PROVISIONS RELIED 1996 SGAT PROVISIONS RELIED 1996 SGAT PROVISIONS RELIED 1996 UPON IN ITS 271 APPLICATIONS ACT OF 1996 SGAT PROVISIONS RELIED 1996 S			
UPON IN ITS 271 APPLICATION US WEST respectfully submits this Reply to the "Response" by the Joint Inte Statement of U S WEST Identifying SGAT Provisions Relied Upon in its 271 Applica response to the Joint Intervenors' pleading, U S WEST states as follows: The Joint Intervenors filed their Response, despite the fact that they assert that action is necessary. U S WEST agrees that no further action is necessary. However, U submits this Reply to clarify the issues raised in the Joint Intervenors' Response. The only issue raised by the Joint Intervenors' Response is whether the Comm			
U S WEST respectfully submits this Reply to the "Response" by the Joint Intervenors Statement of U S WEST Identifying SGAT Provisions Relied Upon in its 271 Applicated response to the Joint Intervenors' pleading, U S WEST states as follows: The Joint Intervenors filed their Response, despite the fact that they assert that action is necessary. U S WEST agrees that no further action is necessary. However, U submits this Reply to clarify the issues raised in the Joint Intervenors' Response. The only issue raised by the Joint Intervenors' Response is whether the Commits.	ON		
Statement of U S WEST Identifying SGAT Provisions Relied Upon in its 271 Applica response to the Joint Intervenors' pleading, U S WEST states as follows: The Joint Intervenors filed their Response, despite the fact that they assert that action is necessary. U S WEST agrees that no further action is necessary. However, U submits this Reply to clarify the issues raised in the Joint Intervenors' Response. The only issue raised by the Joint Intervenors' Response is whether the Comm	venors to		
response to the Joint Intervenors' pleading, U S WEST states as follows: The Joint Intervenors filed their Response, despite the fact that they assert that action is necessary. U S WEST agrees that no further action is necessary. However, U submits this Reply to clarify the issues raised in the Joint Intervenors' Response. The only issue raised by the Joint Intervenors' Response is whether the Comm			
action is necessary. U S WEST agrees that no further action is necessary. However, I submits this Reply to clarify the issues raised in the Joint Intervenors' Response. The only issue raised by the Joint Intervenors' Response is whether the Comm			
submits this Reply to clarify the issues raised in the Joint Intervenors' Response. The only issue raised by the Joint Intervenors' Response is whether the Comm	10 further		
The only issue raised by the Joint Intervenors' Response is whether the Comm	S WEST		
The only issue taised by the contained values is whether the	submits this Reply to clarify the issues raised in the Joint Intervenors' Response.		
$oldsymbol{\mathfrak{g}}$	The only issue raised by the Joint Intervenors' Response is whether the Commission		
needs to "approve" the provisions of the SGAT that are at issue in this case. There see	ms to be		
some confusion regarding what the Commission needs to determine in this proceeding no requirement that the Commission "approve" the SGAT pursuant to 47 C.F.R. § 252	There is		
no requirement that the Commission "approve" the SGAT pursuant to 47 C.F.R. § 252(f). It is			
sufficient that the Commission has allowed the SGAT to take effect, because the SGA	Γ is legally		
binding on U S WEST.	. *. •		
The FCC has held that for each checklist item, the BOC should demonstrate the binding legal obligation to provide the item. The BOC can demonstrate that binding legal obligation to provide the item.	at it nas a		

FENNEMORE CRAIG A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION PHOENIX

obligation by pointing to such a provision in either an interconnection agreement or its SGAT. 1 The FCC addressed this requirement in relation to a SGAT in the BellSouth South Carolina Order: "the BOC must have a concrete and specific legal obligation to furnish the item upon request pursuant to its SGAT." BellSouth South Carolina Order, para. 81. In Arizona, the SGAT is in effect and legally binding. U S WEST also is a party to 5 numerous legally binding interconnection agreements in Arizona. CLECs can opt into the SGAT or one of the interconnection agreements. 7 8 Therefore, the Commission must determine in this case whether either the SGAT or an interconnection agreement contains sufficient language to satisfy a particular checklist item or 9 issue. That is what Mr. DeGarlais stated in the language quoted on p. 2 of the Joint Intervenors' 10 Response. No official "approval" is necessary for the SGAT to be legally binding; it is already 11 binding on U S WEST. The Commission does not need to address in this proceeding whether a 12 particular provision of the SGAT needs to be "approved." However, it must do something 13 similar. The Commission needs to decide whether the provisions of the SGAT or 14 interconnection agreements are sufficient to support a particular checklist item or issue. 15 At the conclusion of this case, the Commission should enter a finding regarding each 16 checklist item declaring whether U S WEST is sufficiently legally obligated to provide that 17 checklist item pursuant to the SGAT or an interconnection agreement. 18 19 20 21 22 23

24

25

1	DATED this 3 rd day of May, 1999.		
2		Respectfully submitted,	
3		U S WEST COMMUNICATIONS, INC.	
4		-H 10	
5		By Dig A	
6		Andrew D. Crain Charles W. Steese	
7		Thomas M. Dethlefs 1801 California Street, Suite 5100	
8		Denver, CO 80202 (303) 672-2948	
9		FENNEMORE CRAIG, P.C.	
10		Timothy Berg 3003 North Central Ave., Suite 2600	
11		Phoenix, AZ 85012 (602) 916-5421	
12		Attorneys for U S WEST	
13		Communications, Inc.	
14			
15	ORIGINAL and 10 copies of the foregoing hand-delivered for filing this 3 rd day of May, 1999, to:		
16	Docket Control		
17	ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION 1200 W. Washington St.		
18	Phoenix, AZ 85007		
19	COPIES of the foregoing hand-delivered this	s 3rd day of May,	
20	1999, to:		
21	Maureen A. Scott, Legal Division ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION		
22	1200 W. Washington St. Phoenix, AZ 85007		
23	Ray Williamson, Acting Director		
24	Utilities Division ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION		
25	1200 W. Washington St.		
26	Phoenix, AZ 85007		

-		
1	J D. 411 1. Chi-fill-rain- Officer	and the second second
2	Jerry Rudibaugh, Chief Hearing Officer	
2	Hearing Division	
3	ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION	
3	1200 W. Washington	
4	Phoenix, AZ 85007	
4		
5	Copies of the foregoing mailed this 3 rd day of	
	May, 1999, to:	
6	Damas Damiala	Lagar C. Davidso
	Penny Bewick	Joan S. Burke
7	Electric Lightwave, Inc.	Osborn Maledon, P.A.
	4400 NE 77 th Ave.	2929 N. Central Ave., 21st Floor
(1)	Vancouver, WA 98662	PO Box 36379
	Electric Lightwave, Inc.	Phoenix, AZ 85067-6379
9		AT&T and NEXTLINK
	Thomas Campbell	m n.
10	Lewis & Roca	Thomas F. Dixon
	40 N. Central Ave.	Karen L. Clausen
	Phoenix, AZ 85004	MCI Telecommunications Corp.
	ACI	707 17 th Street # 3900
12		Denver, CO 80202
	Stephen Gibelli	
	Residential Utility Consumer Office	Michael M. Grant
4 4 1	2828 North Central Ave., Suite 1200	Gallagher & Kennedy
14	Phoenix, AZ 85004	2600 N. Central Ave.
1		Phoenix, AZ 85004-3020
	Andrew O. Isar	Electric Lightwave, Inc.
16 1	Telecommunications Resellers Association	
16	4312 92nd Ave., NW	David Kaufman
17	Gig Harbor, WA 98335	e.spire Communications, Inc.
1 /		466 W. San Francisco Street
	Raymond S. Heyman	Santa Fe, NM 87501
10	Randall H. Warner	
19	Two Arizona Center	Frank Paganelli
1	400 North 5th Street, Suite 1000	Colin Alberts
20	Phoenix, AZ 85004-3906	Blumenfeld & Cohen
	American Payphone Association (APA)	Four Embarcadero Center
21		San Francisco, CA 94111
	Joyce Hundley	ACI
22	U.S. Dept. of Justice	
	Antitrust Division	Michael Patten
23	1401 H Street, NW, # 8000	Lex J. Smith
	Washington, DC 20530	Brown & Bain
24		2901 N. Central Ave.
		Phoenix, AZ 85012
25		Cox and e.spire
		•

1	Donald A. Low
2	Sprint Communications Company, LP 8140 Ward Parkway 5E
3	Kansas City, MO 64114
4	
	Alaine Miller NEXTLINK Communications, Inc.
5	500 108 th Ave. NE, Suite 2200 Bellevue, WA 98004
6	Carrington Phillip
7	Cox Communications, Inc.
8	1400 Lake Hearn Dr., N.E. Atlanta, GA 30319
9	Diane Bacon, Legislative Director
10	Communications Workers of America 5818 N. 7th St., Suite 206
11	Phoenix, Arizona 85014-5811
12	
13	
14	Dane Maramana X
15	The Millian D
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Daniel Waggoner Davis, Wright & Tremaine 2600 Century Square 1501 Fourth Avenue Seattle, WA 98101-1688 NEXTLINK

Richard S. Wolters Maria Arias-Chapleau AT&T Law Department 1875 Lawrence Street # 1575 Denver, CO 80202 AT&T and TCG